DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 212 EC 190 978

AUTHOR Moger, Roxanne L.
TITLE Existing Student Study Team Processes in Selected Volunteer Special Education Local Plan Areas, School Districts, and Schools in California: A Descriptive Evaluation Study. Draft Preliminary Findings. Working Paper No. 3.
INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Office of Program Evaluation and Research.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 6 Apr 86
CONTRACT G0084C3505
NOTE 48p.; For related working papers and the final report, see EC 190 976-981.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Dynamics; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Special Education; *Student Characteristics; *Student Evaluation; Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Child Study Teams

ABSTRACT

The paper is the third of a series of working papers developed by a project which conducted a cooperative study of existing student study team (SST) processes in nine California special education local plan areas. The working papers augment the final report by providing detailed descriptions of the methods used and the preliminary findings. This paper presents tables from survey data received from 30 schools. After introductory material and lists of common descriptors of student problems and instructional modifications, the tables present the following information: purposes of school study teams (rank ordered); student problem characteristics (rank ordered); ranked student characteristics of immediate referrals for special education assessment; SST participants (e.g., resource teacher, principal, parents, classroom teacher); resources available to SSTs rank ordered (e.g., teacher time, teaching materials); SST group processes used (e.g., individual discussion/group decision). (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276212

Existing Student Study Team Processes in Selected Volunteer Special Education Local Plan Areas, School Districts, and Schools in California: A Descriptive Evaluation Study

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roxanne L. Moger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

~~E~~ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Draft Preliminary Findings

Working Paper No. 3

Collected and Assembled by

Roxanne L. Moger

for the Final Report of a State Educational Agency/Federal Evaluation Study conducted by the Program Evaluation and Research Division, California State Department of Education under Cooperative Agreement #G0084C3505 with the United States Department of Education, 1984-1986.

EC 190 978

Sacramento, California
April 6, 1986

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S FOREWARD

This document is one in a series of five working papers produced by staff members of a project established to conduct a cooperative evaluation study of existing student study team processes. The project was partially funded under a cooperative agreement between the Office of Special Education Programs of the U.S. Department of Education and the Program Evaluation and Research Division of the California State Department of Education. The Division assigned the responsibility for administering the project to the Special Studies and Evaluation Reports Unit. The study was conducted in close collaboration with a Project Advisory Committee and staff from 31 schools in 22 school districts in nine randomly selected Special Education Local Plan Areas in California. All local participating agencies and schools were volunteers and were operating some form of student study team process. The duration of the study was from October 1984 through June 1986.

The purpose of this series of working papers is to augment the final report of the study by providing detailed descriptions of (1) the methods developed and used in the study and (2) the preliminary findings which had been presented to local and state- level participants in the study for their review and comment. The title of the final report is "Existing Student Study Team Processes in Selected Volunteer Special Education Local Plan Areas, School Districts, and Schools in California: A Descriptive Evaluation Study." The report, like the working papers, has been submitted to ERIC for dissemination.

The working papers are listed below in the order in which they were completed in final form.

Stockdale, Geoffrey, and Margaret Merrick Scheffelin. "Six Aspects of Existing Student Study Team Processes in Participating Schools, Districts, and SELPAs." Working Paper No. 1. July 1985.

Hickman, Andrew, Geoffrey Stockdale, and Margaret Merrick Scheffelin. "Notebook for Data Collection and Submission: A Working Paper for Use by Special Education Local Plan Area Representatives, Participating Districts, and Schools in the Cooperative Evaluation Study of Existing Student Study Team Processes." Working Paper No. 2. October 1985.

Moger, Roxanne. "Existing Student Study Team Processes in Selected Volunteer Special Education Local Plan Areas, School Districts, and Schools in California: A Descriptive Evaluation Study: Draft Preliminary Findings." Working Paper No.3. April 1986.

Hickman, Andrew, and Geoffrey Stockdale. "A Summary of Responses to the Survey of Student Study Team Participants." Working Paper No. 4. June 1986.

Smith, Kay Slavin. "Procedural Treatment of Individual Student Record Form (Form 13) Data." Working Paper No. 5. June 1986.

To the project staff's knowledge, this study is the first in the nation to yield information on the characteristics of students brought to the attention of student study team processes. There were no tested data collection instruments available for use or adaptation. Project staff, members of the Advisory Committee, and local staff worked cooperatively to develop, review, and complete the data collection forms; to review and critique the preliminary findings; and to review the draft of the final report. The analysis of the data was done by project staff. Analyzing survey data was fairly straightforward; analyzing the intensive student data was a task of another order of magnitude. Much credit is due to the project staff, who successfully carried on the simultaneous tasks of data analysis and flood control. It is common to safeguard one's data from ordinary mishaps such as misfiling or inadvertent discarding of subtotals. It is rare to safeguard one's data from the ever-rising waters of a river threatening to overflow the levee behind the building in which one is working.

In the spirit of shared scholarship the staff offers these working papers as a record of their thought and work and as an assist to scholars who may be examining similar topics in the future. In the spirit of giving credit where credit is due, I wish to acknowledge the creative and assiduous work of the members of the project staff, all of whom were graduate students at California State University, Sacramento, during their work in the project. In the order in which they began their work, they are Geoffrey Stockdale, Andrew Hickman, Kay Slavin Smith, and Roxanne Moger. Staff members Stockdale, Smith, and Moger are in the field of communication studies; Mr. Hickman's field is psychology.

As one of the first evaluation studies funded under the expanded evaluation authorization of Public Law 98-199, the information may be used at local, state, and federal levels. It must be noted that nothing in these working papers, or in the final report, is to be construed as an official policy or position of either the California State Department of Education or the U.S. Department of Education. Finally, the responsibility for omissions and inaccuracies must remain mine, as project director.

Margaret Merrick Scheffelin, Ph.D.
Consultant, Program Evaluation & Research Division

Sacramento, California.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Director's Forward..... (i)

Author's Preface to Revised Draft Preliminary Findings..... 1

I. Expanded Description of Table Construction..... 2

Tables of Data Sources Used in Responding to Selected Original Evaluation Questions..... 13

Summary Listing of Modifications, Student "Problem" Characteristics and Modification/Intervention Ratings..... 16

Frequently Appearing Specific Descriptors of Student "Problem" Characteristics..... 17

Frequently Appearing Specific Descriptors of Modifications and Interventions..... 19

II. Tables of Preliminary Findings (Variations in Student Study Team Processes)

Variation 1: The Frame - Names & Purposes

Table 1..... 20
-1..... 21
-2..... 22
-3..... 23

Variation 2: "Noticers" & Students

Table 2a-1..... 24
-2..... 25
-3..... 26

2b..... 27

Variation 3: Premeeting Procedures & Informal Contact Between SST Members (No Tables)

Variation 4: The SST Meeting

Table 4a..... 28

4b..... 29

4c..... 29

4d..... 30

4e..... 30

4f..... 31

Variation 5: Followup & Feedback

Table 5..... 32

Variation 6: Effects

Table 6a-1..... 33

-2..... 34

6b..... 35

-1..... 36

-2..... 36

-3..... 37

6c..... 38

-1..... 39

-2..... 39

-3..... 40

-4..... 40

Author's Preface to Revised Draft Preliminary Findings

This working paper version of the Draft Preliminary Findings incorporates feedback received at both the northern and southern California participant workshops regarding the tabling and organization of school participant and student record data. It also incorporates for reference purposes supplementary materials specifically prepared for the workshops. Changes to tables include renumbering from workshop draft sequencing to reflect the anticipated reorganization of the final report into Student Study Team Universals and Variations, and the addition of new data.

The school participant total now reflects 30 total schools unless otherwise specified in the description of tables. The additional data comes from schools whose information arrived too late to be analyzed and incorporated in time for the workshops.

Student data tables have also been updated to include previously unincorporated student record data wherever feasible. This additional student data primarily takes into account those students for whom enrollment at the end of the study period could not be determined. Thus, the updated student tables will show a total N of 194 (the older, unrevised tables will continue to show an N of 179). The reader is advised to note the totals especially when examining percentage calculations.

Two new data tables herein have not appeared in any previous draft findings - Tables 2a-3 and 6a-2. This working paper also includes: a description of table construction (including descriptions of the new tables) adapted from the technical appendix prepared for the southern California workshop; lists of frequently appearing specific descriptors for student "problem" characteristics and modifications/ interventions; and tables of data sources for each evaluation question. The lists of specific descriptors and the tables of data sources are based substantially on materials collected by Ms. Kay Smith. Persons familiar and unfamiliar with the research project will find them useful references.

The tabled data reflects the considerable efforts of not only myself but the entire data analysis staff - Geoffrey Stockdale (project co-principal), Andrew Hickman, and Kay Smith. Their exacting attention to precision in data handling and analysis both conceptually and numerically coupled with a working style full of humor and commitment to cooperation consistantly provided me a rare glimpse of truly rewarding research. I am also indebted to Dr. Scheffelin for providing editorial comments critical to preparing a public release of the draft findings. Her ongoing vision that the student study team research prove useful to the participants and ultimately benefit their students guided and focused the preparation of these materials. With due respect extended to all my teammates, I claim any error in calculation or transcription, typographical mishaps, or limitations in table construction description as my own.

Roxanne L. Moger
Research Assistant

EXPANDED DESCRIPTION OF TABLE CONSTRUCTION

The tables which form the body of this working paper are composed of data drawn from Forms 10 (survey of student study team participants) and 13 (individual student record form) of the project data collection instruments.* This discussion seeks to mitigate possible confusion over tabled data by 1) describing similarly constructed tables simultaneously, 2) expanding cell labels where experience to date has demonstrated that the existing abbreviations are misleading or inadequate, 3) by clarifying group totals (N's) where appropriate, and 4) by assisting the reader in following student characteristic and modification interactions across grade levels. The reader is encouraged to examine the tables and text simultaneously for ease in interpreting tabled data. No evaluative remarks will be offered here, only functional commentary aimed at increasing the reader's organizational familiarity with the tabled data. Please refer to the previous working papers and the final evaluation report for analysis and/or conclusions supported by the tables.

---

* Copies of the survey and student record forms are included in Hickman, Andrew, Geoffrey Stockdale and Margaret Merrick Scheffelin. "Notebook for Data Collection & Submission: A Working Paper for Use by Special Education Local Plan Area Representatives, Participating Districts, and Schools in the Cooperative Evaluation Study of Existing Student Study Team Processes." Working Paper No. 2. Program Evaluation and Research Division, California State Department of Education: Sacramento, CA. October 1985. Available through ERIC.

Tables Utilizing Form 10 Data:

Where Form 10 data has been tabled the sections of that instrument will be referenced here. For these Form 10 tables the following "decision rule" was applied before the data was tabled: 50% of all respondents at a school had to select the item for it to be included in the school's total. At least ten school staff members filled out surveys at each participating school. Except where otherwise noted the total number of schools submitting useable Form 10 data is 30. This total is composed of 16 Elementary schools (K-6), 6 Intermediate schools (7-9), and 8 Secondary schools (9-12).

Tables 1, 1-1, -2 and -3 are all constructed such that "purpose" statements appear on the left with the number of schools indicating that purpose as a "purpose of our SST". Tabled data arose from Form 10, Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4, respectively.

Table 4a tables SST "members" which were viewed as either regular or intermittent members of the respondent's school SST. Where responses from a school were evenly split between regular and intermittent membership, the responses were split for that item before totaling (Data from Form 10, Section 2).

Tables 4b, 4c, 4d and 4e are all similarly organized. All present data from Form 10. The same 50% "decision rule" applies to the data in these tables. Table 4b presents data from Form 10, Section 4.1: "which resources were available" to apply to a student's problems. 4c tables SST group process data from Section 5. Tables 4d and 4e relate to the persons whose judgments could be used to judge "success" of modifications or interventions (Form 10, Section 7a), and

to types of records taken into account when judging "success of modifications or interventions" (Form 10, Section 7b).

Tables 4f and 5 are slight variations from the above format. Here the survey questions held more than one part and these parts, themselves, held more than one subpart. Table 4f collapses data from Form 10, Sections 8a, b, and c which addressed criteria to judge "success" of modifications/ interventions in three broad areas - academic achievement, behavioral changes, and social/emotional changes. Similarly, Table 5 is organized to reflect the possible variations in the SST feedback procedures (i.e., reportage on "success" of suggested modifications, who gives such reports, when, responses to "success" reports by SSTs, and acceptance of outside agency reports. Form 10, Section 6).

Tables 6b, 6b-1, 6b-2, and 6b-3 draw from Form 10, Sections 1.1-1.4. The elements in these tables are rank ordered by their "rating". The rating scheme relates to the individual respondent's judgment of the effectiveness with which an SST achieves its goals. The "rating" was derived by assigning a numerical value to each effectiveness judgment: 1 = poor, 2 = moderate, 3 = excellent. The individual responses were totaled and multipled by the total number of respondents for the appropriate response option and then totaled across all three grade level response groups (total respondents = 180). The range of rating for a particular purpose statement would, therefore, be 0-540. All five rating tables present data rank ordered by total number of schools. The ratings tables have not been recalculated for this working paper, thus they are based on the original 24 schools.

The factors supporting effective Student Study Teams were grouped in the survey into four categories: leadership, responsibility, cooperation, and communication. Table 6c incorporates all the 6c subtables into one table allowing the reranking of the various factors supporting effective student study teams independent of their specific foci. Table 6c-1 ranks and presents leadership factors supporting effective SSTs (Form 10, Section 9a). Table 6c-2 ranks and presents responsibility factors; 6c-3, cooperation factors; and 6c-4, communication factors supporting effective SSTs (Form 10, Section 9b, c, and d, respectively).

Tables Utilizing Form 13 Data:

The tables utilizing Form 13 data incorporate a numeric rating system coupled with the modifications/interventions letters (a = Environment through i = Behavior Shaping). These project-developed "codes" have been applied to the student "problem" characteristics which made up individual pages in Part II of Form 13 (i.e., A = Reading through O = Other Characteristics). A copy of the Summary Listing of Student Characteristics, Modifications/Interventions and Ratings has been included in this working paper for the reader's reference; however, wherever feasible the exact names of the respective characteristics or modifications/interventions have been included in the present versions of the tabled data.

The student groups addressed include those who finished the study period enrolled in regular education only, enrolled in regular education PLUS categor-

ical or district programs, special education enrollees, and students immediately referred for special education assessment. When the tables present data for "regular education" students this data combines the regular education only enrollees with those students who may be receiving services under categorical and/or district programs. Any students who ended the study period with special education enrollment (whether that enrollment also included some regular education enrollment or not) have been treated as "special education" students.

Originally those students for whom ending enrollment could not be determined (typically because the student moved from the school or district or dropped out of school altogether) were excluded from incorporation in the tabled data even though data analysis had been performed on their student records. The exclusion was based on the judgment that these student records were incomplete in some way (for example when the student's study team lost the student before modifications could either be applied or given sufficient time to have effect) or because other aspects of the analysis included taking into account ending enrollment and therefore complete records were preferable. In keeping with the descriptive intent of the study, after the workshops previously excluded student records were reexamined and efforts were made to include this information despite ending enrollment data limitations.

For updated student record tables a new 194 student total is marked (the older, unrevised tables will continue to be labeled for 179 total students). The appropriate sizes of the student groups involved will also be presented with the discussions of the tables below. Persons familiar with previous versions of the student record findings will, however, notice few changes resulting from the incorporation of the additional data.

For tables which count characteristics and/or modifications applied to "problems" instead of students, the reader should recall that a given student may exhibit "multiple problems" (more than one characteristic being addressed by the SST) for which more than one modification may have been brought to bear. In fact, within a given problem characteristic, several different specific modifications of a type (e.g., Teaching Techniques) could have been attempted with varying results. In keeping with the descriptive nature of the research, all possible information was coded and counted. The table descriptions below specify whether a given table represents student, "problem" characteristic, or modification/ intervention counts.

For tables which present data in percentage of total rather than direct counts of incidence, percentage totals not equal to 100% are due to roundoff error. Because grade level percentages arise from unequal grade level Ns and are not based on "normal" systematic sampling the reader is cautioned against deriving conclusions from apparent grade level differences.*

Table 2a-1 rank orders "problem" characteristics for all 194 students. Individual students may be represented in more than one characteristic total (most students exhibited multiple "problem" characteristics). This table gives an introductory look at the students' "problems" the participating student study teams handled during the study period. This table may be directly com-

---

* Project participation was voluntary. Participating schools reflected a wide diversity school enrollment, community characteristics, and resources available for students. For further discussion of methodology see the project final report.

pared with the tabled data for students which the participants reported immediately referring for special education assessment (N=51), Table 2b.

Table 2a-2 replaces former Tables 11.1-11.5. As in previous versions, Table 2a-2 is organized across several dimensions. The rows order the data by grade level (here Primary (K-3) has been separated from upper Elementary (4-6).) Characteristics have been organized into four group categories:

Group 1 = Individual Academic Subjects (reading, math, spelling, writing, speaking, & handwriting),

Group 2 = Overall Academics (academic performance & academic behavior),

Group 3 = Overall Behavior (school behavior & social/emotional adjustment), and

Group 4 = General Health/Organic Problems (motor coordination, preschool development, perceptual dysfunction, general health).

(This numbering is one of convenience and does not reflect in any way an opinion about the relative importance of one category over another but rather imitates the original ordering of the characteristics on Form 13 record forms. Characteristic 0 (Other) was not included in this table because this data varied too widely to allow placement of the characteristic within any one of the group categories.)

In the table the four group categories are separated by double vertical lines. For each group category subcolumns have been marked 1, 2+, and none. Subcolumn 1 holds the number of students at each grade level for which any <u>one</u> of the component characteristics within that grouping was cited within that student's record (e.g., in Group 1, reading). Subcolumn 2+ holds the number of students at each grade level whose records show <u>two</u> <u>or</u> <u>more</u> of the component characteristics were indicated. For convenience a subtotal for subcolumns 1 and 2+ has been incorporated into this version to facilitate comparison with the

"none" subcolumn. "None" holds the number of student records for which the component characteristics for that group were not indicated. Individual students may be represented in more than one group but are only counted once within a given group.

For Groups 2 and 3 there are only two component characteristics. Groups 1 and 4 have six and four component characteristics, respectively. Totals across the four grade levels for all 194 students for which the school participants provided records are provided. Percentages by grade levels and totals are also included although comparison across grade levels would be colored by the limited number of students representing each grade level and the uneven grade level N's.

Although individual students may be represented in more than one group, careful examination of Table 2a-2 reveals exactly the magnitude of one characteristic group in relation to the other characteristic groups for the students examined. For example, although almost 60% of the students presented "problems" in either individual academic subjects (Group 1) or overall academic performance (Group 2), 42% of the students did not exhibit "problems" in any one of the individual academic subjects. Sixty-eight percent of the students the school participants reported on did not present any of the four health characteristics (Group 4). On the other hand, for nearly one-third of the students physical or organic "problem(s)" formed at least part of the constellation of concerns their Student Study Teams had to take into account when recommending modifications or interventions to enhance the student's ability to learn.

New Table 2a-3 is organized in much the same way as 2a-2 except it is specifically aimed at minimizing the "double counting" across characteristic groups inherent in 2a-2's design. Individual student records are tallied to only one table cell. By presenting each of the group category tallies and percentages both individually and in relation to each of the other categories, variations and diversity within the total student records can be examined. For convenience in labeling on this table the group numbers listed above have been used as column labels to conserve space.

Table 2a-3 adds to the understanding of student diversity begun with Table 2a-2. For instance, although 42%* of the students did not exhibit "problems" in any one of the specific academic subjects (Group 1), 29% of the students did not exhibit any "academic problem" whatsoever (Individual Subjects and Overall Academics, together**).

This table also helps adjust conceptions about trends: the impact of any one category can be portioned out by viewing it alone or in combination with other groups. For example, although overall behavior (Group 3) was cited in over half the student records^, overall behavior was cited as the ONLY "problem" in 14% of the cases.

---

* 1only + 1,2 + 1,3 + 1,4 + 1,2,3 + 1,2,4 + 1,3,4 + all
28 + 9 + 5 + 5 + 20 + 11 + 4 + 30 = 82/194 or 42%

** 1only + 2only + 1,2
28 + 20 + 9 = 57/194 or 29%

^ From Table 2a-2, 108 or 56% of the student records indicated either one or both behavior component characteristics as "problems" for those students.

Along the same lines, Table 2a-3 shows that the highest percentage of behavior "problems" (Group 3) occurs when this group appears with ALL other groups (30 students or 15%), followed by when it occurs entirely alone (28 students or 14%). Twenty-two percent* of the students have behavior characteristics associated with individual academic subjects or overall academics but only 3% of all the students' records showed any of the individual academic subjects linked exclusively with the behavior characteristics (Group 1 and Group 3, paired).

Table 6a-1 presents Form 13 data on the modifications/ interventions applied to the student "problem" characteristics. Counts show the total number of students for whom particular modifications/ interventions were indicated in the student records. As explained above, there may be more than one incidence of a modification type to count within a student case. This version of the ranked incidence of modifications/ interventions counts the modifications/ interventions only once within a student record and the totals given, therefore, represent the actual number of students whose records indicated the use of a particular modification/ intervention. Previously all citations of a modification/ intervention (of which several could occur within a student record on each of several different characteristics) were counted. This change

---

* 1,3 + 2,3 + 1,2,3
5 + 17 + 20 = 42/194 or 22%

or, if Health (Group 4) is added in

1,3 + 2,3 + 1,2,3 + 1,3,4 + 2,3,4 + all
5 + 17 + 20 + 4 + 3 + 30 = 78/194 or 40%

is another attempt to minimize "double counting". Earlier versions also excluded Outside Resource Intervention and Parent Contact as external to the classroom environment. They are included in the ranking here.

Table 6a-2 focuses on the student "problem" characteristics "successfully" modified or intervened in. This table reflects counts of the total number of modifications or interventions rated as resulting in positive change or "success" (ratings of 2.3 or higher) for that "problem" characteristic. For this table all modifications/ interventions which were within the rating range were counted even if there was more than one per characteristic. Additional information is given as to totals for other active modification ratings. This table shows the magnitude and diversity of total effort applied to the students' "problem" characteristics.

Table 6a-2 replaces a rather lengthy two-step rank-ordered listing which responded to original evaluation question 14. Part of what has been dropped is the ranking of particular modifications/ interventions successfully applied to particular "problem" characteristics. Feedback from the workshops indicated the two-step rankordering was very difficult to understand. The workshop participants also indicated that the overwhelming dominance of Outside Resource Intervention as the most "successful" intervention was of limited utility without specifying which resource professionals were useful for which student "problem" characteristics. (Outside Resource Intervention was ranked as the most often "successful" intervention for two-thirds of the "problem" characteristics which were "successfully" intervened in.) The reader is referred to the project final report for further discussion of findings relevant to "successful" intervention in student "problem" characteristics.

Data Sources Used in Responding to Selected Evaluation Questions.		
Question #	Evaluation Question	Data Source(s)
EQ 1	What is the purpose of Student Study Teams?	Form 10: Items 1.1-1.4
EQ 2	What are the necessary elements of a Student Study Team?	Form 10: Items 2a-2c
EQ 3	What are the optional elements of a Student Study Team and why?	Form 10: Items 2a-2c
EQ 4	What is the process of a Student Study Team at a school site?	"Project Report No. 6: Preliminary Descriptions of Six Aspects of Existing Student Study Team Processes at Participating Schools, Districts, and SELPAs." Forms 10, 11 & 13.
EQ 5	Does the process accomplish the purposes of Student Study Teams?	Form 10: Items 1.1-1.4
EQ 6	What resources were available for the suggestions/ modifications/ interventions for a student?	Form 10: Item 4.1
EQ 7	What processes do Student Study Teams use for matching the modifications of the regular class program to student dysfunctions and abilities?	Form 10: Item 5

Data Sources Used in Responding to Selected Evaluation Questions.

Question #	Evaluation Question	Data Source(s)
EQ 8	What procedures or criteria do teams use to measure, judge, or determine whether a modification of the regular classroom program is "successful" for a particular student?	Form 10: Items 6a-6e
EQ 9	What are the variables which lead to effective Student Study Teams at elementary, intermediate and secondary schools? Are there similarities and/or differences across school levels?	Form 10: Items 9a, 1-8; 9b, 1-4; 9c, 1-4; 9d, 1-4
EQ 10	What are the characteristics of students referred to SSTs and how many times do these characteristics occur?	Form 13: Part II
EQ 11	Are there patterns of characteristics such as at grade levels or subject areas? Are there patterns for those students immediately referred for special education assessment?	Form 13: Parts I, II, V
EQ 12	Which modifications were used with students?	Form 13: Part II

Data Sources Used in Responding to Selected Evaluation Questions.

Question #	Evaluation Question	Data Source(s)
EQ 13	How do SSTs determine whether a student is "successful" after suggested modifications have been made?	Form 10: Items 7a, 1-6; 7b 1-11; 8a 1-3; 8b, 1-4; 8c, 1-5
EQ 14	Which student characteristics are associated with the success of particular modifications?	Form 13: Part II

Summary Listing of Student "Problem" Characteristics, Modifications/ Interventions and Modification/Intervention Ratings.

CHARACTERISTICS

(A) Reading
(B) Math
(C) Spelling
(D) Writing
(E) Speaking
(F) Handwriting

(G) General Academic Performance
(H) Academic Behavior

(I) Social/ Emotional Adjustment
(J) School Behavior

(K) Motor Coordination
(L) Preschool Development
(M) Perceptual Dysfunction
(N) General Health

(O) Other Characteristics

MODIFICATIONS/INTERVENTIONS

(a) Environment
(b) Materials
(c) Assignments
(d) Teaching Techniques
(e) Learning Channels
(f) Miscellaneous
(g) Parent Contact
(h) Outside Resource Intervention
(i) Behavior Shaping

MODIFICATION/INTERVENTION RATINGS:

0 = Modification Not Pursued/ Rejected By Parent

Referral Process:

1.0 = Status Unknown
1.1 = Awaiting Assessment
1.2 = Modifications Being Developed
1.3 = Referral Complete; No Active Modification Warranted

Active Modification:

2.0 = Unable to Judge "Success" (Too soon to tell/ No comments offered/ "success" not applicable)
2.1 = Modification Terminated - Unsuccessful
2.2 = Modification Proceeding - No Change Indicated; Not Apparently Working
2.3 = " " - Marginal or Limited Success
2.4 = " " - Moderate to Good Results
2.5 = " " - Extremely Successful
2.6 = Modification Terminated - Problem Resolved/ Modification Successful

FREQUENTLY APPEARING SPECIFIC DESCRIPTORS* OF STUDENT "PROBLEM" CHARACTERISTICS

(A) Reading	Decoding; word attack skills/ phonetics; comprehension.
(B) Math	Number reversals; concepts; basic computation.
(C) Spelling	Skill well below reading achievement; cannot spell from list or dictation; omits or adds letters.
(D) Written Language	Writing sentences; grammar; poor written expression.
(E) Spoken Language	Poorly retained auditory input; poor listening skills, poor understanding of commands or directions; unable to express thoughts and feelings.
(F) Handwriting	Reverses letters; difficulty copying from page and blackboard.
(G) General Academic Performance	Forgets previously learned material; few academic strengths; slow learner; knowledge gaps (surprises as to what is known/not known).
(H) Academic Behavior	Wastes class time; does not/cannot follow directions; has difficulty understanding directions, questions, or comments; doesn't bring materials to class.
(I) Social/Emotional Adjustment	Withdrawn; often angry; inadequate self-concept; poor frustration tolerance; doesn't relate well to peers; hyperactive.
(J) School Behavior	Doesn't "own" actions/blames others; completes little work; is passive resister; poor attitude to adult authority.
(K) Motor Coordination	Poor hand-eye coordination, fine motor coordination.

* Specific descriptors have been taken directly from the student record forms; the expressions listed are the expressions of the study participants and do not reflect any imposition of terminology by the project staff.

(L) Preschool Development	Primarily relates to developmental delays.
(M) Perceptual Dysfunction	Reversals; visual decoding; memory problems: visual input/ oral input; retrieval/output: oral, written.
(N) General Health	Low vitality; visual problems; auditory problems.
(O) Other	Changes/problems in home environment; concerns about student reentry after illness or social problems; poor attitude towards school, bored with/hates school.

FREQUENTLY APPEARING SPECIFIC DESCRIPTORS* OF MODIFICATIONS AND INTERVENTIONS

a. Environment	Use small groups; increase one-to-one instruction; use peer or adult tutors; change schedule, class, or grade assignment.
b. Materials	Use specific diagnostic or learning materials; remedial math or reading programs; Chapter I/ School Improvement Program (SIP) and Miller-Unruh services.
c. Assignments	Simplify or shorten; specialized assignments; alternative assignment structures; individualized contracts.
d. Teaching Techniques	Classroom contracts; use behavior modification techniques; repeat directions/instructions same way, more slowly, differently; reinforce correct responses promptly; use praise for learning achievements.
e. Learning Channels	Teach to sensory strength; use kinesthetic/tactile approach; neurological impress system; drill to overlearn.
f. Miscellaneous	Keep work samples; collect information on student.
g. Parent Contact	Parent/Teacher, /Principal, /Counselor conferences; daily, weekly, biweekly phone calls or notes or reports; home/school contracts, esp. for behavior.
h. Outside Resource Intervention	Psychologist for testing; classroom observation by principal, psychologist, learning specialist, nurse; screening by above/ use of in-class diagnostic materials; referrals to learning, vocational, behavior specialists or programs.
i. Behavior Shaping	Systematic monitoring; use of peer tutor, cross-age or teacher aides; individual contracts for behavior; reinforcement of desired social and/or academic behaviors; share information about student with staff, administrators and parents.

* Specific descriptors have been taken directly from the student record forms; the expressions listed are the expressions of the study participants and do not reflect any imposition of terminology by the project staff.

Table 1. PURPOSES OF STUDENT STUDY TEAMS (Rank Ordered*)	
PURPOSE	# SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Coordinate delivery of services & interventions	29
Serve regular ed students with learning problems	29
Refer student to other programs if necessary	29
Ensure correct academic placement	28
Provide team approach to work on student's problem	28
Act as a resource in developing interventions	28
Make recommendations for modifications/interventions	28
Develop interventions to enable student to function in regular ed program	27
Provide quick approach to maximize each student's education	27
Plan regular ed strategies BEFORE deciding on special ed referral	27
Provide assistance to classroom teachers	26
Provide specialists to assist with student's problem	26
Review difficult cases	26
Discuss student problem RATHER THAN eligibility for special ed.	26
Serve regular ed students with emotional problems	25
Coordinate delivery of services to students	25
Develop creative ways of dealing with students	25
Provide immediate support for classroom teachers	25
Serve regular ed students with behavioral problems	23
Monitor progress of modifications/interventions	23
Encourage staff and parent participation in student strategy	23
Provide psychologist good history to assist assessment tool selection	23
Provide regular ed teachers chance to brainstorm on student	22
Make remediation a total school (vs. special ed) enterprise	20
Eliminate unnecessary assessment	18
Provide secondary resource specialist program referral	16

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item a "purpose" for it to be tabled as a purpose of SSTs.

This table combines tables 1-1, -2, and -3.

Table 1-1. PURPOSES OF SSTs AT 30 SCHOOLS, STUDENT FOCUS
(Rank Ordered)

PURPOSE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Coordinate delivery of services & interventions	29
Serve regular ed students with learning problems	29
Ensure correct academic placement	28
Develop interventions to enable student functioning in regular ed program	27
Provide quick approach to maximize each student's education	27
Serve regular ed students with emotional problems	25
Serve regular ed students with behavioral problems	23

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to be tabled as a SST focus.

Table 1-2. PURPOSES OF SSTs AT 30 SCHOOLS; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOCUS (Rank Ordered)

PURPOSE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Refer student to other programs if necessary	29
Provide team approach to work on student's problem	28
Act as a resource in developing interventions	28
Make recommendations for interventions	28
Provide assistance to classroom teachers	26
Provide specialists to assist with student's problem	26
Review difficult cases	26
Coordinate delivery of services to students	25
Develop creative ways of dealing with students	25
Provide immediate support for classroom teachers	25
Monitor progress of interventions	23
Encourage staff and parent participation in student strategy	23
Provide regular ed teachers chance to brainstorm on student	22

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to have been tabled as a SST focus.

Table 1-3. PURPOSES OF SSTs AT 30 SCHOOLS, SPECIAL EDUCATION FOCUS (Rank Ordered*)

PURPOSE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Plan regular ed strategies BEFORE deciding on special ed referral	27
Discuss student problem RATHER THAN special ed eligibility	26
Provide psychologist good history to assist assessment tool selection	23
Make remediation a total school (vs. special ed) enterprise	20
Eliminate unnecessary assessment	18
Provide secondary resource specialist program referrals	16
Help coordinate categorical programs	10
Hold down special education team paperwork	9

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to be tabled. Items not meeting this "50% decision rule" are included here for interest only.

Table 2a-1. RANK-ORDERED STUDENT "PROBLEM" CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. STUDENTS PRESENTING CHAR.* (N = 194)
General Academic Performance e.g. test results, performance in comparison to grade, forgets prev. learned material	91
Social/Emotional Adjustment e.g. withdrawn, poor frustration tolerance, doesn't relate well to peers	83
Academic Behaviour e.g. wastes class time, gives up easily, doesn't bring materials to class	81
Reading	75
School Behaviour e.g. easily distracted, poor attitude toward adult authority, excessive tardies/absenses	74
Math	44
Speaking	44
Perceptual Dysfunction	43
Spelling	38
Writing	36
Handwriting	32
General Health	29
Motor Coordination	27
Other Characteristics	22
Preschool Development	2

* Individual students may be represented in more than one characteristic total.

Table 2a-2. TOTAL STUDENTS BY CHARACTERISTIC GROUPING
(Number of Characteristics Indicated per Grouping by Grade Level)

NO. STUDENTS BY GRADE LEVEL	NO. SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS WITHIN A CHARACTERISTIC GROUP INDICATED											
	Individual Subjects (reading, math) (A-F)			Overall Academics (academic performance, academic behavior) (G-H)			Overall Behavior (school behavior, soc/emot adjustment) (I-J)			General Health/ Organic Problems (motor coordination, general health) (K-N)		
	1	2+	none	1	2+	none	1	2+	none	1	2+	none
Primary (n=76)	53 (70%)			43 (57%)			42 (55%)			29 (38%)		
	21 (28%)	32 (42%)	23 (30%)	22 (29%)	21 (28%)	33 (43%)	19 (25%)	23 (30%)	34 (45%)	20 (26%)	9 (12%)	47 (62%)
Elementary (n=25)	12 (48%)			18 (72%)			15 (60%)			11 (44%)		
	2 (8%)	10 (40%)	13 (52%)	9 (36%)	9 (36%)	7 (28%)	6 (24%)	9 (36%)	10 (40%)	4 (16%)	7 (28%)	14 (56%)
Intermediate (n=47)	21 (45%)			25 (53%)			30 (64%)			6 (13%)		
	9 (19%)	12 (26%)	26 (55%)	9 (19%)	16 (34%)	22 (47%)	21 (45%)	9 (19%)	17 (36%)	5 (11%)	1 (2%)	41 (87%)
Secondary (n=46)	26 (57%)			27 (59%)			21 (46%)			17 (37%)		
	12 (26%)	14 (30%)	20 (43%)	14 (30%)	13 (28%)	19 (41%)	13 (28%)	8 (17%)	25 (54%)	9 (20%)	8 (17%)	29 (63%)
TOTALS (N=194)	112 (58%)			113 (58%)			108 (56%)			63 (32%)		
	44 (23%)	68 (35%)	82 (42%)	54 (28%)	59 (30%)	81 (42%)	59 (30%)	49 (25%)	86 (44%)	38 (20%)	25 (13%)	131 (68%)

* Individual students may be represented in more than one group.

Table 2a-3. TOTAL STUDENTS BY GROUPED CHARACTERISTICS (Apportioned)

NO. STUDENTS BY GRADE LEVEL (N=194)	ONE GROUP ONLY INDICATED				TWO GROUPS INDICATED						THREE GROUPS INDICATED				ALL GROUPS INDICATED	CHAR. "O" ONLY	GRADE LEVEL TOTALS	TOTAL SNGL GROUPS
	G1	G2	G3	G4	1,2	1,3	1,4	2,3	2,4	3,4	1,2,3	1,2,4	1,3,4	2,3,4				
Primary (n=76)	11 (14%)	3 (4%)	10 (13%)	4 (5%)	5 (7%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	0	11 (14%)	6 (8%)	2 (3%)	0	13 (17%)	1 (1%)	76 (100%)	28 (37%)
Elementary (n=25)	2 (8%)	4 (16%)	3 (12%)	0	0	0	1 (4%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)	0	0	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	0	6 (24%)	0	25 (100%)	9 (36%)
Intermediate (n=47)	7 (15%)	5 (11%)	10 (21%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	0	6 (13%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	8 (17%)	0	0	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	47 (100%)	23 (49%)
Secondary (n=46)	8 (17%)	8 (17%)	5 (11%)	0	2 (4%)	0	2 (4%)	3 (7%)	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	9 (20%)	2 (4%)	46 (100%)	21 (46%)
TOTALS (N=194)	28 (14%)	20 (10%)	28 (14%)	5 (3%)	9 (5%)	5 (3%)	5 (3%)	17 (9%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)	20 (10%)	11 (6%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)	30 (15%)	4 (2%)	194 (100%)	82 (42%)

Group 1 (G1) - Individual Academic Subjects: reading, math, spelling writing, speaking, handwriting

Group 2 (G2) - Overall Academics: general academic performance, academic behavior

Group 3 (G3) - Overall Behavior: social/emotional adjustment, school behavior

Group 4 (G4) - General Health/Organic Problems: motor coordination, preschool development, perceptual dysfunction, general health

Table 2b. RANKED CHARACTERISTICS OF IMMEDIATE REFERRALS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. STUDENTS PRESENTING CHAR.* (N=51)
General Academic Performance e.g. test results, performance in comparison to grade, forgets prev. learned material	37
Academic Behavior e.g. wastes class time, gives up easily, doesn't bring materials to class	27
Math	21
Social/Emotional Adjustment e.g. withdrawn, poor frustration tolerance, doesn't relate well to peers	21
School Behavior e.g. easily distracted, poor attitude toward adult authority, excessive tardies/absenses	20
Reading	19
Writing	17
Speaking	16
Motor Coordination	14
Perceptual Dysfunction	13
Other Characteristics	11
Spelling	10
General Health	7
Handwriting	4
Preschool Development	0

* Individual students may be represented in more than one characteristic total.

Table 4a. SST PARTICIPANTS (Regular and Intermittent Members) REPORTED BY 30 SCHOOLS (Rank-Ordered)

PARTICIPANTS	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING		
	(N=30)	regular	intermittent
Resource Teacher**	30	29	1
Regular Classroom Teacher	28	22	6
Psychologist	29	22.5^	6.5
Principal	20	19	1
Resource Specialist**	26	22.5^	3.5
Speech Teacher	24	12	12
Teacher-member of SST	22	19.5^	2.5
Parents	20	9.5^	10.5
Speech Specialist	20	9	11
Nurse	18	7	11
Other Interested Teachers	20	3	17
Special Day Class Teacher	17	7	10
Student's Previous Teacher	18	.5^	17.5
Counselor	16	11	5
Student's Receiving Teacher	16	2	14
Student	11	5	6

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to be tabled. Items not meeting this "50% decision rule" are included for interest only.

** The student record forms suggested possible confusion as to the difference between these two professional categories. It is impossible to determine if there is any such confusion inherent in the tabled responses above.

^ In some instances responses from a school were evenly split between regular membership and intermittant membership in the SST. These cases are noted by splitting the responses.

Table 4b. RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO SSTs AT 30 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered*)	
RESOURCES AVAILABLE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
SST process materials (e.g. forms)	29
Teacher time	26
Assessment/data collection materials	26
Teaching aids & materials	24
Others participants' time	24

Table 4c. SST GROUP PROCESSES USED TO RECOMMEND INTERVENTION TECHNIQUES AT 30 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered*)	
PROCESS USED	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Individual discussion/ Group decision	30
Individual discussion/ Referring teacher reaction	26
Leader directs discussion	26
Parent participation in discussion	21

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to be tabled.

Table 4d. INFORMATION SOURCES USED TO JUDGE STUDENT SUCCESS AFTER MODIFICATIONS/INTERVENTIONS IN 30 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered*)

INFORMATION SOURCE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Student's teachers	30
Other involved professionals	27
SST members	27
Student's parents	26
Other teachers	20

Table 4e. RECORDS USED TO JUDGE STUDENT SUCCESS AFTER MODIFICATIONS/INTERVENTIONS AT 30 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered*)

RECORD TYPE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Completeness of work	30
Classroom test scores	28
Number of absenses/truancies	28
Incidence of "acting out"	27
Achievement test scores	26
Experts' observations (e.g. school nurse, psychologist)	25
Number of tardies	22
Number of fights	20
Tests of emotional/developmental stability	15

* At least half the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to be tabled.

Table 4f. CRITERIA USED TO JUDGE STUDENT SUCCESS AFTER MODIFICATIONS/INTERVENTIONS AT 30 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered* by Section)

CRITERIA	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Changes in Academic Achievement:	
Improvement over previous performance	30
Closer achievement/ability match	26
Decline from previous performance	17
Changes in Behavior:	
Reduction in unwanted behavior	30
Appearance of new, desired behavior	28
Elimination of unwanted behavior	27
Persistance of unwanted behavior	20
Changes in Social/Emotional Adjustment:	
Improved emotional stability	28
Reduced emotional display	28
Increased emotional maturity	27
Decreased visible anxiety	26
Increased frustration threshold	22

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item for it to be tabled.

Table 5. TYPES OF FEEDBACK PROCEDURES RELATING TO JUDGMENT OF SST-RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS/INTERVENTIONS AT 30 SCHOOLS

FEEDBACK PROCEDURE	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Feedback given at:	
Predetermined review date	16
Any regularly scheduled meeting	11
Emergency meetings	5
Feedback given to the SST by:	
Persons responsible for modifications	29
Other observers to modifications	3
SST discusses feedback on modifications and:	
Evaluates success of modifications	20
Develops consensus on judgment of success	9
Accepts interpretations by influential team members	1
No feedback given and lack is:	
Taken as "no news is good news"	10
Is a problem for the SST	4
Outside agency reports may lead to SST's judgement of success of modifications/interventions	9

Table 6a-1. RANK-ORDERED STUDENT MODIFICATIONS/INTERVENTIONS

MODIFICATION TYPE	NO. STUDENTS* (N=179)
Outside Resource Intervention e.g. Referral to spec ed, resource specialist, principal, nurse, ESL, psychologist	156
Environment e.g. change teacher, grade, school; use tutors; reduce distractions; 1-1 instruction	82
Parent Contact e.g. parent/teacher conferences; parent as aide; phone calls to parent; progress repors	70
Teaching Techniques e.g. classroom contracts; use praise; use visual aids; repeat instructions; use peer as role model	56
Behavior Shaping e.g. tutors as behavior models; systematic behavior monitoring; enlist student in problem solving	42
Assignments e.g. simplify; shorten; individual contracts; extend time; restructure priorities	41
Materials e.g. use different materials (task cards, filmstrips records); use remedial programs; use computer	36
Learning Channels e.g. determine and teach to strongest sensory channel - auditory, visual, kinesthetic	8
Miscellaneous e.g. collect documentation of intervention/modification history; keep work samples	8

* Within a student case several modifications/interventions of a given class could have been attempted both within a problem and across multiple problems. This table simply counts the occurance of a modification/intervention class once within a student record. Modification/intervention classes of the same rank are listed alphabetically.

Table 6a-2. "PROBLEM" CHARACTERISTICS SUCCESSFULLY* MODIFIED OR INTERVENED IN FOR 194 STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. SUCCESSFUL MODIFICATIONS/ INTERVENTIONS
School Behaviour e.g. easily distracted, poor attitude toward adult authority, excessive tardies/absenses	60
Social/Emotional Adjustment e.g. withdrawn, poor frustration tolerance, doesn't relate well to peers	51
General Academic Performance e.g. test results, performance in comparison to grade, forgets prev. learned material	46
Reading	43
Academic Behaviour e.g. wastes class time, gives up easily, doesn't bring materials to class	40
Speaking	29
Math	26
Perceptual Dysfunction	26
Spelling	26
Handwriting	16
Motor Coordination	13
Writing	13
General Health	9
Other Characteristics	7
TOTAL	405 (40%)

*Success = ratings of 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, or 2.6.

Other relevant totals:

Rating 2.0 ("unable to tell") = 383 (38%)]
2.1 ("terminated - not successful") = 21 (2%)] = 599 (60%)
2.2 ("proceeding - no change") = 195 (19%)]

PLUS "successful" mods/interv = 405 (40%)

1004 Active Modifications

Table 6b. RATED EFFECTIVENESS AT MEETING VARIOUS PURPOSES* AT 24 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered)

PURPOSE	RATING
Student referral to other programs if necessary	458
Make recommendations for interventions	449
Provide team approach to student's problem	445
Coordinate delivery of services and interventions	429
Develop interventions	425
Serve regular ed. students with learning problems	407
Maximize each student's education	401
Ensure correct academic placement	397
Provide specialists to assist with student's problem	392
Coordinate delivery of services	384
Plan strategies & test BEFORE special ed. referral	368
Review difficult cases	365
Act as resource in developing interventions	364
Discuss problems RATHER THAN special ed. eligibility	357
Develop creative ways of dealing with student's problem	351.5
Provide good student background to psychologist	349
Encourage staff & parent participation in student strategy	341
Monitor progress of interventions	332
Provide immediate support system for classroom teachers	326
Provide regular ed. teachers opportunity to "brainstorm"	320
Serve regular ed. students with emotional problems	315
Provide assistance to classroom teachers	312
Make remediation a total school enterprise	305
Serve regular ed. students with behavioral problems	299
Eliminate unnecessary assessment	291
Referral to secondary resource specialists	244
Hold down special ed. team paperwork	184
Help coordinate categorical programs	150

* This table combines tables 6b-1, -2, and -3.

Table 6b-1. RATED EFFECTIVENESS AT MEETING STUDENT FOCUS PURPOSES AT 24 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered)

PURPOSE	RATING
Coordinate delivery of services and interventions	429
Develop interventions	425
Serve regular ed students with learning problems	407
Maximize each student's education	401
Ensure correct academic placement	397
Serve regular ed students with emotional problems	315
Serve regular ed students with behavioral problems	299

Table 6b-2. RATED EFFECTIVENESS AT MEETING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PURPOSES AT 24 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered)

PURPOSE	RATING
Student referral to other programs if necessary	458
Make recommendations for interventions	449
Provide team approach to student's problem	445
Provide specialists to assist with student's problem	392
Coordinate delivery of services	384
Review difficult cases	365
Act as resource in developing interventions	364
Develop creative ways of dealing with student's problem	351.5
Encourage staff & parent participation in student strategy	341
Monitor progress of interventions	332
Provide immediate support system for classroom teachers	326
Provide regular ed teachers opportunity to "brainstorm"	320
Provide assistance to classroom teachers	312

Table 6b-3. RATED EFFECTIVENESS AT MEETING SPECIAL EDUCATION PURPOSES AT 24 SCHOOLS (Rank Ordered)

PURPOSE	RATING
Plan strategies & test BEFORE special ed referral	368
Discuss problems RATHER THAN special ed eligibility	357
Provide good student background to psychologist	349
Make remediation a total school enterprise	305
Eliminate unnecessary assessment	291
Referral to secondary resource specialists	244
Hold down spec ed team paperwork	184
Help coordinate categorical programs	150

Table 6c. VARIOUS FACTORS^ SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE SSTs
(Rank Ordered*)

FACTORS	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Individuals accept responsibility for tasks to be completed outside SST meetings	28
Written reminders to SST members of upcoming meetings	28
Records of SST decisions and task assignments	28
Regular ed and special ed staff communicate informally outside SST meetings on student's problem	27
All staff involved with student's modifications attend SST meetings	26
Team 'shares' in successes of modifications/interventions	26
Regular ed teachers accept responsibility for referring students to SST	26
Individuals complete tasks by outside SST meetings by expected dates	25
Site administrator attendance at SST meetings	22
Chairperson for SST meetings	22
Site administrator expectation for regular ed staff participation	20
Expressed support of SST by site administrator	19
A facilitator at SST meetings to keep meetings "on track"	18
Reminders with student names & current status for upcoming SST meetings	18
Expert discussion in SST	17
Review dates specified at time of initial modifications/ interventions	16
Student's parents are invited to become active SST members	14

^ This table combines tables 6c-1, -2, -3, and -4.

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item a "purpose" for it to be tabled as a purpose of SSTs. Items not meeting this "50% decision rule" are included for interest only.

Table 6c-1. LEADERSHIP FACTORS SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE SSTs
(Rank Ordered*)

LEADERSHIP FACTORS	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Site administrator attendance at SST meetings	22
Chairperson for SST meetings	22
Site administrator expectation for regular ed staff participation	20
Expressed support of SST by site administrator	19
A facilitator at SST meetings to keep meetings "on track"	18
Expert discussion in SST	17

Table 6c-2. RESPONSIBILITY FACTORS SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE SSTs
(Rank Ordered*)

RESPONSIBILITY FACTORS	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Individuals accept responsibility for tasks to be completed outside SST meetings	28
Team 'shares' in successes of modifications/interventions	26
Regular ed teachers accept responsibility for referring students to SST	26
Individuals complete tasks by outside SST meetings by expected dates	25

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item a "purpose" for it to be tabled as a purpose of SSTs.

Table 6c-3. COOPERATION FACTORS SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE SSTs
(Rank Ordered*)

COOPERATION FACTORS	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Regular ed and special ed staff communicate informally outside SST meetings on student's problem	27
All staff involved with student's modifications attend SST meetings	26
Student's parents are invited to become active SST members	14

Table 6c-4. COMMUNICATION FACTORS SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE SSTs
(Rank Ordered*)

COMMUNICATION FACTORS	NO. SCHOOLS INDICATING (N=30)
Written reminders to SST members of upcoming meetings	28
Records of SST decisions and task assignments	28
Reminders with student names & current status for upcoming SST meetings	18
Review dates specified at time of initial modifications/ interventions	16

* At least half of the participant schools had to indicate an item a "purpose" for it to be tabled as a purpose of SSTs. Items not meeting this "50% decision rule" are included for interest only.